

(6)
means for reconciling said first information and said second information, so that all ordinal intervals are reconciled between said first and second information, by constructing at least one list based, at least in part, on said common ordinal interval.

(GJ)
23. (Twice Amended) In an information processing system, a method for reconciling at least two information sets, including a first information set and a second information set, using at least a third information set, the method comprising:

receiving a request to reconcile the at least two information sets, said at least two information sets including information entries which are initially incompatible for reconciling;

including information entries from the first information set into the third information set;

selectively inserting information entries from the second information set into the third information set, said third information set now containing information entries that are compatible for reconciling the first and second information sets; and

updating the first information set with information from the third information set.

Remarks

Claims 1-11 and 13-42 are pending in the application. The Examiner has indicated that all of these claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner wrote as follows:

As per claim 1, line 7, "other information" is not clear. It is unclear if applicant is referred to the "first information" or the "second information". Lines 6-7 contains negative limitations that add no positive weights to the claim. On line 10, the phrase "may be" renders the claim indefinite since it is unsure in the ordinal intervals are reconciled.

As per claim 23, the phrase "can be" also renders the claim indefinite since it is unclear the reconciling is transferable to the third information set.

Also in claim 23, the phrase "in a manner" is unclear and indefinite since the manner is not positively recited in the claim.

Claims 24-25 are rejected based on their dependencies.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 23 to address each of these bases for the section 112 rejections. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant also submits that the amendments have not substantially changed the scope of the claims, so that the claims remain patentable over the prior art. Applicant has deleted the following clause from claim 23: "but which can be transferred to the third information set in a manner that renders said at least two information sets compatible for reconciling." Applicant respectfully submits that this clause was substantially redundant in view of the last three clauses of claim 23.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Re-examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (831) 461-5535.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 3, 2001



Darryl A. Smith; Reg. No. 37,723
Attorney for Applicant

Legal Department
Starfish Software, Inc.
1700 Green Hills Road
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
(831) 461-5535
(831) 461-5900

SF/0006.02



RECEIVED

OCT - 9 2001

PATENT

Technology Center 2100

Docket No. SF/0006.02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Martin Frid-Nielsen et al.

Serial No.: 09/060,206

Filed: Herewith

For: System and Methods for Appointment
Reconciliation

Examiner: Poinvil, F.

Art Unit: 2164

MARKED UP VERSIONS

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This paper is being filed along with an amendment of the same date. Pursuant to the requirements of 37 CFR §1.121, Applicant hereby submits marked up versions of the text changed in the amendment filed concurrently herewith.

In the claims:

1. (Five-times Amended) A system for processing and reconciling information comprising:

an information processing system having a memory and a processor;

means for entering first information and second information, each of said first and second information including a plurality of ordinal intervals, wherein [at least one of] said first [and second] information includes [a disparate] an ordinal interval that is [not shared by] different from each of the plurality of ordinal intervals of the [other] second information;

means for selecting a common ordinal interval between said first and second information, wherein all ordinal intervals are a multiple of said common ordinal interval [so that all ordinal intervals may be reconciled between said first and second information]; and

means for reconciling said first information and said second information, so that
all ordinal intervals are reconciled between said first and second information, by constructing at least one list based, at least in part, on said common ordinal interval.

23. (Twice Amended) In an information processing system, a method for reconciling at least two information sets, including a first information set and a second information set, using at least a third information set, the method comprising:

receiving a request to reconcile the at least two information sets, said at least two information sets including information entries which are initially incompatible for reconciling [but which can be transferred to the third information set in a manner that renders said at least two information sets compatible for reconciling];

including information entries from the first information set into the third information set;

selectively inserting information entries from the second information set into the third information set, said third information set now containing information entries that are compatible for reconciling the first and second information sets; and

updating the first information set with information from the third information set.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 3, 2001



Darryl A. Smith; Reg. No. 37,723
Attorney for Applicant

Legal Department
Starfish Software, Inc.
1700 Green Hills Road
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
(831) 461-5535
(831) 461-5900

SF/0006.02